

REMARKS and ARGUMENTS

This response is to the Office Letter mailed in the above-referenced case on Oct. 16, 2007.

2.0 In response to Examiners Claim Rejections of claims 19-28 based on Hite, U.S.

7,213,061, and claims 29-36 based on Gelvin, U.S. 6,826,607, claims 19, 24, 29 and 34 have been amended to overcome Examiner's rejection based on lack of a structural difference.

2.1 Claims 19, 24, 29 and 34 are amended to include, substantially:

"...all communication to the sensing subsystems and actuating subsystems is done through a control unit ...".

2.2 Reference to the functionality of the "input-output section" is found on page 29, L19 of the current application and on page 7, L8 of the referenced application, U.S. 09/477,226, included in its entirety in the current application by reference.

Applicant respectfully points out that neither Hite nor Gelvin teach a system comprising a base station and a control unit wherein:

"...all communication to the sensing subsystems and actuating subsystems is done through a control unit ..."

As Examiner Bayard pointed out in our telephone conversation of Nov. 27, Gelvin does allow for a "wired" connection between a sensor node and an internet gateway; however Gelvin does not teach or suggest a control unit, not internet enabled, through which all communication with a sensor node travels. Gelvin teaches and requires a sensor node to be internet enabled.

4.0 Claims 19, 22-24, 27-28 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,213,061 to Hite et al.

4.1 Claims 19, 24, 29 and 34 are amended as pointed out above. Sensors and actuators are

accessible only through a control unit, a condition clearly structurally different from Gelvin and Hite and stated in the claims.

5.0 Claims 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,266,607 to Gelvin et al.

5.1 Claims 19, 24, 29 and 34 are amended to overcome Examiner' rejection as previously stated.

6.0 Applicant respectfully points out that the prior art references relied upon by the Examiner as a §102 rejection do not contain every element recited in the amended claims in as complete detail as is contained in the amended claims and arranged as recited in the amended claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl.No. 09/633,801
Amdt. Dated Dec. 7, 2007
Reply to Office action of Oct. 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

____/Dennis S. Fernandez/____
Dennis S. Fernandez, ESQ.
Reg. No. 34,160

Date: 12/13/2007

Address: **FERNANDEZ & ASSOCIATES, LLP**
Patent Attorneys

Customer No: **22877**
Phone: (650) 325-4999
Fax: (650) 325-1203
Email: *iploft@iploft.com*